DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 351 CE 055 706

AUTHOR Carspecken, Phil
TITLE The Theory of Community Education. A Social-Theoretical Critique.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 39p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Education; Educational Change; Educational History; *Educational Sociology; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *Parent Role; Political Power; *Power Structure; *Social Control; *Social Structure

ABSTRACT

A large body of literature was reviewed to examine the concept of community education. The review was based on the sociological concept of power as it pertains to education--how power enters into educational institutions through formal decision-making procedures, methods of assessment, and views of knowledge. The study began with a schematic review of literature on the sociology of education to set the context for a discussion of the notion of community education. The study found that many researchers were concerned with the relationship of schooling to social inequality and suggested, explicitly or implicitly, ways of changing education toward a situation of greater equality. It also found that community education locates domination and power in the decision-making processes that affect curriculum and instruction. Curriculum and instruction, in turn, produce in the majority of working class pupils a sense of failure and incompetence. Advocates of community education thus view the school in ways that promote combining learning with social action. However, there are theoretical objections and practical problems with community education, such as parental attitudes, power, examinations, pupil resistance, and lack of resources. These problems may stem from limitations in the implicit theory of power used by advocates of community education. (An extensive, 302-item reference list is provided in this paper.) (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P F Carspecken

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED323351

THE THEORY OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION

A Social-Theoretical Critique

Phil Carspecken

This paper critically examines the concept of community education. It does so by developing the sociological concept of power as it pertains to education: how power enters into our educational institutions through formal decision making procedures, methods of assessment, and views of knowledge. It begins with a fairly schematic review of literature on the sociology of education to set the context for a more lengthly discussion of the notion of community education.

I Schools and Inequality

The sociology of education expanded rapidly as an academic field in Britain just after World War Two at the same time that educational provision itself was rapidly extended. The introductory sections of a number of articles and books on educational sociology present the development of the discipline through the description of a number of theoretical orientations which have risen sequentially to prominence (eg. Karabel and Halsey 1977, Whitty 1985). Usually included are:

1) The political arithmetic approach of the 1950s and early 1960s (e.g. D.V. Glass, 1954; Floud, Halsey and Martin 1957, see also Halsey, Heath and Ridge 1980).

2) Theories of cultural deprivation produced during the latter 1960s (see Boyd 1977 and Keddie 1971b for reviews).

3) The 'new' sociology of education of the very late 1960s and early 1970s (e.g. Brown, 1973, M.F.D. Young 1971a).

4) Theories of social and economic reproduction (e.g. Bowles and Gintis 1976, Dale 1977).

5) Cultural reproduction and education (e.g. Willis 1975, 1977, 1983, Mcrobbie 1978, Everhart 1983).

6) And what could be called 'post reproduction' theories (e.g. Wexler 1982, Apple 1979, 1982 introduction, 1983; Giroux 1981, 1983; Connell, Ashenden, Kesslerl, and Dowsestt 1982).

The main concern of each approach is with the relationship of schooling to social inequality. Most of these theoretical orientations suggest, explicitly or implicitly, a way of changing education towards a situation of greater equality. Comprehensive schools, for example, were adopted as educational policy in the 1960s with theoretical support from the early political arithmetic school, compensatory education programmes corresponded to the cultural deprivation thesis, community education schemes were concerned with problems identified in works of the 'new' sociology of education, and some form of 'socialism' is implicitly advocated in the work of the social and cultural reproduction theorists (Whitty 1985).

These theoretical approaches may be distinguished from each other in a number of ways. Below, brief descriptions of each approach are provided. The different schools are contrasted with each other by examining their assumptions about power and knowledge and the different objects of study they each take. In some of the short summaries below references are omitted. The reader may refer to the list of approaches just above to find relevant works cited.

A) Political Arithmetic

Political arithmetic was (and where still practised, is) concerned with questions of access and types of schools. It viewed the school as a site where all children can gain knowledge an equal standard. Developing in the 1950s when secondary schooling was tripartite, it was interested in relating class backgrounds to types of schools attended and final occupational outcomes. Educational inequality was above all inequality of access to equal schools. Different schools teach different types of knowledge providing different occupational opportunities. Knowledge itself is viewed as something essentially neutral, not entering as such into social relationships of inequality. The problem of inequality was a problem of fair access to knowledge, not a problem concerning forms of knowledge and teaching practices. The major questions to be answered by sociological analysis were therefore questions over which pupils entered which schools to learn what sorts of knowledge. The effects of political arithmetic on educational policy were its contribution towards the expansion of education and the movement towards the comprehensivisation of 11+ provision. Educational power was seen to be located ultimately in political and bureaucratic institutions determining educational provision. The focus of analysis was on mobility routes - what occurred inside schools was not taken as the main object of study.

B) Cultural Deprivation

Theories of cultural deprivation were early attempts to explain the failure of the comprehensive programme to alter the mobility routes of pupils. Working class pupils were still getting working class jobs in the mid-1960s and cultural deprivation theories located the explanatory variable was the culture of the home. School knowledge was still seen as a neutral possession which was transmitted to pupils, but now through a cultural medium. Culture was seen to include a set of *values* which either facilitated or obstructed constructive work habits, as a set of *linguistic practices* which either aided or hindered knowledge acquisition, and as a set of *self images* which influenced aspirations. Power was still located in the bureaucracies of the state but the focus of analysis had shifted from access to

schools to the effects of culture on educability. In terms of policy, cultural deprivation theories led to various forms of compensatory education.

C) Community Education

Advocates of community education such as Midwinter (1972, 1973, 1975), Halsey (1972) and Hargreaves (1982), make use of a somewhat different view of *school knowledge* than that implicit in cultural deprivation theory (as well as political arithmetic). Knowledge, from the community education perspective, is seen as information and skills which has its value in terms of its relevance to the lives of those acquiring it. As different social groups have different needs, the type of knowledge taught in schools ought to be different as well. Where the type of knowledge is identical (e.g. numerical skills), the *form* in which these skills are taught ought to differ, out to make full use of the culture and concerns of the communities which particular schools serve. Knowledge is thus not seen as a neutral acquisition, valuable in itself, but as something which out to be useful, where relevant use is determined by local conditions and needs.

Like cultural deprivation theories, community education programmes view the disparity between the middle class culture present in most schools and the cultures in which working class and ethnically diverse pupils live as the major explanatory variable for the perpetuation of inequality through schooling. But instead of recommending a course of compensatory training to bring middle class culture to the pupils of the working class, it recommends conducting education itself in the cultures of the communities surrounding the school. Doing so entails another difference from the perspectives considered so far: advocates of community education have often called for the devolution of educational decision making power to parents and residents served by schools. The argument is that for community education to work communities must somehow gain more power over the curriculum and pedagogic practices of their schools. Community education schemes have also generally attempted to alter the traditional power relationship between teachers and pupils, to allow local cultures to be expressed through the increased participation of pupils in the planning and organising of their educational activities. All aspects of community education theory, and the results of a number of attempts to implement it, are discussed in more detail in the next section.

D) The 'New' Sociology of Education

The 'new' sociology of education was concerned primarily with what is called 'the hidden curriculum': "...those unstated norms, values, and beliefs embedded in and

transmitted to students through the underlying rules that structure the routines and social relationships in school and classroom life" (Giroux, 1983 p 47). This has also been a key concern of community education (Hargreaves 1982), and in fact there are many overlaps in these two perspectives. One could argue that community education has been a practical attempt to solve the problems theorised by the 'new' sociology of education, although the prominent authors and practicioners of both groups are distinct. One of the better known advocates of the new sociology of education specified three areas of study for sociologists of education:

- the mental categories of educators
- classroom interaction
- educational knowledge

Gorbutt, cited in Whitty, (1977)

Community education has recognised problems in each of these areas and has suggested alterations in teacher-pupil and school-community power relationships as the solution. But the concepts of power and domination receive greater theoretical elaboration in the 'new' sociology of education. Theorists in this school see power exercised through the imposition of norms, values, and general orientations to reality (e.g. passive and accepting as opposed to active and transforming) upon pupils. These norms and values exist implictly in the selection and organisation of knowledge, the patterns of interaction within the classroom, and the form and content of curricular texts. The 'new' sociology of education thus conceived of power relations mediated through schooling practice in terms of the pupil subjectivities which it shapes. Knowledge is therefore not just regarded with respect to its usefulness or its cultural form (which influences educability). Knowledge is ideological and schooling acts to maintain power relations in society not only through the consistent failure of subordinate groups to compete well on its terms but through its transference of ideological orientations to those pupils who do succeed on its terms.

The 'new' sociology of education produced a variety of studies which claimed to have found ideological effects accompanying the organisation of knowledge and schoolroom practice in a number of ways (see Whitty 1977; Whitty and Young 1976). Two very basic themes which have been consistently present in these studies can be noted in particular. One is the reification and commodification of knowledge (see Whitty 1977). School knowledge is reified because it disguises its social origins. As Young points out (1971b), school knowledge is always the result of certain selections from a large number of possible knowledges. It is organised in specific ways and arranged in a status hierarchy which has social origins rather than any

intrinsic origins in knowledge itself. Knowledge is a social product which can and does alter over time. But knowledge isn't presented in this way in the classroom. Instead it's usual mode of presentation is that of something fixed and neutral which can be unproblematically transmitted by teachers and possessed by pupils. Its appearance in this form produces a passive and unquestioning attitude on the part of pupils and gives them an orientation towards knowledge which precludes their own possible contribution to its production. Moreover, the division and organisation of knowledge into a status hierarchy helps to select pupils for the occupational hierarchy. Academic knowledge is first made separable from the sorts of knowledges involved in manual skills and then given a higher status than the latter. The 'new' sociology of education points out that this corresponds to the separation of mental and manual labour in society - it is an organisation of knowledge with social, not intrinsic origins (Young 1971b). School knowledge is a form of ideology.

For changing society, the 'new' sociology of education advocated altering the consciousness of educators, making the hidden curriculum explicit and therefore alterable (see Whitty 1985 for excellent summary). This belief could actually be argued to represent an inconsistency in the theoretical assumptions most commonly accompanying work in the 'new' sociology of education tradition, because it tends to ascribe a great deal of autonomy to the consciousness of teachers, and their realms of possible activity, while viewing pupils as passive recipients of the hidden messages of schooling. Teachers, in other words, are seen as agents capable of dramatically changing their practice with a change in consciousness while pupils are seen as doomed to play out the roles, values and identities imbibed through processes of socialisation. Even if the 'new' sociology of education were to defend itself by arguing that in the case of both teachers and pupils, *awareness* is the key variable in whether or not one is subject to ideology, the approach ignores the question of the *origins* of ideology. While schools were viewed as sites in which the consciousness of pupils was strongly shaped, there was little or no connection theorised between the forms of this consciousness and the economic and political structures of society. Correspondences between the two were noted, but the *way* in which these correspondences form wasn't explained. Both of these shortcomings in the 'new' sociology of education, its failure to examine the *active* appropriation, alteration, and rejection of the hidden curriculum by pupils and its lack of a theory which connects ideological effects associated with the organisation of knowledge to broader societal structures, were addressed within subsequent theoretical trends.

E) Social Reproduction

Social reproduction theories of education were attempts to link social structure to education through a marxist framework. *Schooling in Capitalist America* by Bowles and Gintis (1976) is amongst the best known works of this type. It argues that the inequalities of class relations in capitalist society are reproduced in schools through a direct correspondence between teacher-pupil authority relations and employer-worker relations. The correspondences described in the book are argued to be determined by the economic structure of capitalist society. Bowles and Gintis were important in the recent history of the sociology of education for drawing attention to the relation between social structure and schoolroom practice. Their argument was that direct relationships between the formation of pupil subjectivities in schools and economic relations in society exist.

Correspondence theory gives power a functionalist location in social structure. School practices have the correspondences they do, and produce the results they do, because capitalist society 'needs' them to. The organisation of knowledge is given second place to assesssment and forms of authority relationships as the principle features of schooling which influence pupil subjectivity. The focus of analysis is upon similarities between school social relationships and workplace social relationships.

The shortcomings of *Schooling in Capitalist America* are widely recognised, and are acknowledged by Bowles and Gintis themselves (Gintis and Bowles 1981, see also Karabel and Halsey 1977, introduction). In particular, correspondence has been shown to be a much too simplistic model of the relationship between the school and the economy. Where direct correspondences do exist, explanations must be provided of them without recourse to functionalism, and there are many instances where such correspondences do not exist. The mediating role of policy in the relationship between school practice and economic relationships is ignored in *Schooling in Capitalist America*, as is the extent to which autonomous action on the part of both pupils and teachers can alter, resist, or contribute to such correspondences. Pupils in particular are once again seen as much more passive and receptive of the messages of the hidden curriculum than is actually the case.

F) Cultural Reproduction

Cultural reproduction theories continued the interest in relations between capitalist social structure and processes of schooling but introduced cultural production as the mediating link between the two. Willis's book *Learning to Labour*

(1977), produced from a cultural studies perspective, is probably the most well known of a number of studies which examine the production of resistance cultures in schools for the role they play in reproducing social relations (McRobbie 1978, Everhart 1983). During the 1960s, Lacey (1970) and Hargreaves (1967) both studied the formation of resistance cultures in schools from a symbolic interactionist framework, but the cultural studies perspective pointed out relationships between the formation of such subcultures to cultures in other locations of society.

Cultural reproduction has been criticised as a paradigm for its implicit use of a reified view of social structure (Wexler 1982). Although the approach explicitly concerns itself with the agency of pupils and their rejection and transformation of the ideologies associated with classroom practice and school knowledge, it pits agency against a pre-given social order which makes the latter appear ultimately unchangeable in the end. Its critics have pointed out that like correspondence theory, reproduction locates power ultimately in a reification of what is actually on-going human activity (Apple 1982, introduction). Willis himself (1981) has argued that these criticisms apply more to *interpretations* of his work rather than what his study actually illustrated and claimed. His point is that systems of action on different social sites which reinforce each other operate *through* agency, through cultural forms of knowledge, and thus offers a way of not reifying the concept of social structure.

G) Post Reproduction Theories

During the 1980s sociological work on education has continued to be published from a number of different perspectives but the concerns of this thesis draw us particularly to a community of sociologists who share a broad view termed 'post-reproduction' here. Many in this group have themselves journeyed through the 'new' sociology of education and then versions of marxist analysis (primarily versions of reproduction theory) to come to either focus on highly specific empirical studies of one or two aspects of education (e.g. Anyon 1979, 1981), or on clarifying a number of theoretical concepts which had been previously employed in too monolithic or vague a manner. These concepts include 'culture', 'ideology', 'power', 'resistance', and 'structure' (e.g. Apple, 1983; Giroux 1983).

Hence post-reproduction work has been more concerned with complexity than with over-all paradigms. There has been an effort to combine insights gained by the 'new' sociology of education with those produced in work on reproduction. Some of the theoretical work of cultural studies has influenced the work of many authors in

this group, problematising the concepts of agency, culture, and structure and their inter-relations. Michael Apple, for example, writes of the need to develop:

> a particularly sensitive perspective; a combination of what might be called a socio-economic approach to catch the structural phenomena and what might be called a cultural program of analysis to catch the level of everydayness.
>
> Apple (1982), p 94

Apple explicitly recognises the importance of the debates between structural and cultural marxism (se "Social Theory and Social Movements II", Carspecken) and applies some of the distinctions made in cultural studies (Johnson 1979b) to education. Thus, for example, Apple distinguishes between aspects of culture in a way similar to Johnson: culture as lived experience in and through which pupils accept, resist, an/or transform the ideologies of school practice and ('common sense'), culture as a commodity for the labour market in Bourdieu's sense of 'cultural capital' (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977), and culture as articulated theory or ideology (Apple 1982, p 18).

Giroux (1983) similarly, (though his analysis differs significantly from that of Apple and other authors we've included in this group) concerns himself with the complexity of situating schools in society: one must look at the many ways in which power and domination become expressed and maintained in the school: from processes of transmission in which 'the official language [of the school], school rules, classroom social relations, the selection and presentation of school knowledge, [and] the exclusion of specific cultural capital' serve to construct pupil subjectivities in ways reflecting dominant patterns of social inequality, to the use of blatant coercion in order to maintain control (see also Sharpe and Green 1975; Anyon 1981). Ideology, Giroux argues, must be analysed in its practical and theoretical forms, and in the complex ways it becomes articulated in specific locations through the media of historical traditions and cultural norms (Giroux 1983, p 372).

The drift of this work seems to be towards something akin to the action-theoretical and cultural studies approaches I have reviewed in an earlier publication with respect to social movements (Carspecken: "Social Movements and Social Theory II). It has already been noted, for example, that convergences are evident with Willis's use of a cultural studies perspective to analyse systems of action between the school and other social sites that are mediated by cultural production and Giddens' concept of social system. In *Learning to Labour* (Willis 1977) the type of system relationship described is a barely monitored one, in which the knowledgeability of the 'lads' works in only partial ways which are not cognisant of the reproductive loop between school, shopfloor and home/community culture which the

resistance culture they produce contributes to. Apple's study of the production of school textbooks according to the logic of commodity production (1984), on the other hand, is an example of a more monitored system relationship - monitored through a structural set (to use Giddens' term) which allows for the convertibility of certain types of knowledge production into marketable goods. Studies of educational policy formation (Salter and Tapper 1981) involve a more highly monitored system relationship. Other studies, like those of Buswell (1980), Brown (1981) and Anyon (1978, 1979) on structures of meaning in school texts are essentially examinations of what could be called 'congealed' cultural products in a cultural studies perspective (Johnson 1983), and relatable to the 'paradigmatic dimension' of social structure distinguished by Anthony Giddens (1979). Hence it would be possible to incorporate much of the work of post-reproduction sociology of education into the action-theoretical and cultural studies perspectives outlined in chapter four.

Table 1: Inequality and Schooling, Different Theoretical Perspectives

INEQUALITY AS:	VARIABLES TO CHANGE	OUTCOMES
biased access (political arithmetic)	type of school, number of schools	career, knowledge
cultural form in which knowledge is taught (cultural deprivation)	amount and type of schooling given to different pupils	career, knowledge acquired
hidden curriculum i.e.: selection of knowledge, organisation of knowledge and pedagogic practice ('new sociology' & community education)	the mental categories of teachers and their professional milieu	pupil subjectivity and pupil assessment
hidden curriculum (correspondence)	social structure	pupil subjectivities
hidden curriculum and systematic linkages between forms of cultural production and social relations on various social sites (cultural reproduction)	to a certain extent the awareness of pupils, the resources they have with which to construct culture	pupil culture → jobs and job culture.

To summarise this section, the review of approaches provided above is useful for the attention it draws to possible roles which schools play in mediating and reproducing relations of domination in society. This review has drawn our attention to a number of different ways in which inequality and schooling have been viewed and theoretically related. Some approaches have considered inequality primarily in terms of mobility chances, others have viewed it in terms of class relations and their partial legitimation through the subjectivities which schooling shapes, still others have viewed the school as a site of cultural production which exists in systematic relationships with other social sites such as the workplace. Table 1 summarises the discussion, listing different understandings of inequality taken by the different approaches, noting which outcomes of schooling they take as their objects of interest and which aspects of schooling they have presented as necessary to alter in order to change these outcomes. Because of the diversity and complexity of the work I've grouped together as the 'post-reproduction' approach, this body of work cannot be included in the chart.

II Community Education

In the brief description of community education given above, I emphasised that this approach locates domination and power in the decision making processes which effect curriculum and pedagogy. Curriculum and pedagogy, in turn, effect subjective dispositions developed in pupils during their years of schooling, producing in the majority of working class pupils a sense of 'failure, incompetence, and impotence' (Halsey 1972, p 11). Advocates of community education thus view the school in ways highly similar to many theorists of the 'new' sociology of education because both are concerned with the experience of schooling as effected by curricular content and classroom relations. But the hopes of community education theorists have not rested so much with a change of consciousness in teachers which sociological publications may bring about but rather on the devolution of decision making power towards the school and community levels. The predicted results have been a change of pedagogic and curricular practice in the direction of socially relevant activity, combining learning with social action (Halsey 1972).

The idea of community education goes back at least as far as Henry Morris (see Fletcher 1980). Henry Morris, director of education in Cambridgeshire in the post First World War period, was faced with problems of rural school depopulations. His solution was formulated along three basic principles: bring village residents of all ages into the school buildings, make aspects of the community itself educational,

and share facilities with other community organisations. The results were largely successful and the idea soon spread to Leicestershire and Cumberland.

Community education first began to be thought of as a possible solution to urban problems during the 1960s when it began to be clear that comprehensive schools alone failed to eliminate class based differences in achievement. After the Newsom Report on non-grammar school pupils entitled *Half Our Future* (1963), attempts were made in many schools to develop 'community curricula' for pupils in the slower, non-examination streams of comprehensive schools. But these programmes were latter dropped as being inadequate. They carried a stigma within schools which still operated under an examination ethos, and 'Newsom pupils' failed to show the anticipated motivation, partially in consequence (Boyd 1977). This period of the 1960s was also the time when compensatory education, based on the cultural deprivation thesis, was tried out in policy.

Between 1968 and 1971 the Educational Priority Area (EPA) projects, run under the direction of A.H. Halsey, were carried out as efforts at finding ways of raising the educational performance of children in inner city districts of four British cities through increasing parental involvement, community awareness and responsibility, and improving teacher morale (Halsey 1972). They were consciously planned as alternatives to the compensatory approach, rejecting the goal of bringing middle class culture to the working class in favour of altering middle class curriculum and school authority relationships to meet working class needs. The Liverpool project, directed by Eric Midwinter, went the furthest in designing an alternative curriculum to achieve these ends. Midwinter saw the object of his innovations to lie in aiding those living in disadvantaged areas to learn traditional skills more readily, gain a sense of dignity through the emphasis put on the immediate environment, and greatly increase parental involvement (Midwinter 1972). He envisioned community education as a way of aiding those confined to deprived urban areas to *change* their environment, thus linking the idea of community education with community action.

During the 1970s a number of secondary schools attempted to extend the ideals of comprehensive education to include forms of community schooling. In their survey of a variety of such schools, Hatch and Moyland (1972) found the attempt to blur community-school distinctions to be the essence of the community schooling principle, and they specified two approaches to it: a 'moderate' approach and a 'radical' one. In the moderate approach, comprehensive schools simply make their

facilities available to the community and offer adult education courses. They may offer classes which adults and pupils attend together. The radical approach aims at introducing a 'community curriculum' for all pupils. Learning activities which entail the sorts of suggestions made by Midwinter (and Hargreaves in recent times, Hargreaves 1982), and which aim at maximising the presence of the community in the school are key aspects of the radical version. At the same time, the radical version advocates putting schools under community control. Williams and Robins (1980) make a similar distinction to that made by Hatch and Moyland in their study of California community schools by aligning the schools they studied along a 'community education continuum' having 'programme-oriented' activities on one end and 'process-oriented' activities at the other. The process-oriented end of the pole includes aims of community action, grass roots democracy and self-actualisation, implying a combination of progressive pedagogy with local power similar to Hatch and Moyland's radical approach.

It is clear through the examination of Halsey's and Midwinter's writings that the concept of community education developed through the EPA 'action experiments' was of the radical, not the moderate, variety. Curricular innovations and the devolution of power were both key features in their recommendations. So were the combination of learning with grass roots democracy and social change. It is this sense of community education, the 'radical' or 'process' sense, that will be considered in the rest of this discussion.

The generally shared goals of many (radical) community education projects can be summarised in the following points:

1) To change the educational experience of lower class pupils in a way which will prepare them for life in deprived conditions:

> what we intend is the opposite of a soporific: it is not to fit children for their station in life in an ascriptive sense. It is to accept that many children must lives out their lives in deprived areas and to inspire them to think boldly about it rather than lapse into resigned apathy. (Halsey 1972, quoted in Hargreaves, D. 1982, p 120)

2) To change the curriculum of inner-city schools with the above goal in mind:

> the primary duty of the school would be so to familiarise its pupils with their type of community and its likely future that, as citizens, they would be better equipped to cope with the social issues presented to them. In brief, the community school must have a community curriculum. (Midwinter 1973, p 67).

Thus the curriculum would incorporate aspects of local community life, including projects aimed at changing the environment. Midwinter's recommendations suggest a curriculum that stress skills rather information,

social rather than academic content, and make wide use of art, craft and drama (ibid). As Poster (1982, p 3) emphasises, the curriculum must put process over product, stressing pupil participation and interpersonal relations.

3) To devolve educational decision making power away from both state administrative bodies and educational professionals to adults in the community. As Poster writes:

> The prime distinction has to be made from the outset: are community education programmes devised *for* people or *with* people. (Poster 1982, p 122)

As the 1970s proceeded, results of long-term efforts to apply community education ideals in various comprehensives became available for study and for the re-evaluation of the policy. Bob Moon (1983), in a summary of six accounts of such efforts, concludes that a problem common to nearly all such attempts lay between the 'progressive ideas' of the educationalists and the 'conservative' attitudes of parents (p 133):

> This discrepancy between the ambitions of those in the schools and the unfamiliarity of the community, represents a central dilemma in the efforts to reform comprehensive education. How is it possible to reconcile a commitment to changing what, for many young people, is clearly an unsatisfying experience with an equal commitment to acknowledging the significance and importance of community opinion on the directions the school should take?

Other writers have agreed that the objectives of community education for changing the content and style of teaching ironically runs into serious obstacles from adults in the community. Bernstein, in 'Pedagogies: Visible and Invisible' (1977) argues that the progression of roles based on age and gender in working class communities are in opposition to age and gender roles accompanying progressive education, and thus predicts that parental understanding of the pedagogical objectives of progressive schools is nearly impossible in the case of the working class. David Hargreaves (1982) believes for similar reasons that one of the key components of the radical version of community education, the devolution of power to parents, may have to be dropped:

> at the present time it is very unlikely that parents would be strongly in favour of a community centred curriculum in a comprehensive school; it is much more likely that they would show a strong preference for the traditional curriculum... A community centred curriculum is much more likely to be developed in a school where the head teacher and staff are committed to the notion but are highly insulated from relatively powerless and non-participating parents. (1982, p 124)

Yet insulation can lead to disastrous consequences as the case of William Tyndale Primary School (where enraged parents helped to close down a school which employed 'progressive' methods without any prior communication or consultation with them -

see Dale 1979) and Rising Hill Comprehensive (see Berg 1968) show. More importantly, removing the components of participation and grass roots power from the notion of community education greatly weakens it. Many would argue that genuine community education is not possible without such participation - it is the only way that curriculum and teacher-pupil relationships can meaningfully correspond to, rather than conflict with, the culture of the locality. Without such a correspondence, 'progressive' teaching methods remain alien importations which continue to provide an unequal educational experience through the hidden curriculum (Bernstein, 1977).

Thus it is not surprising that actual efforts at creating community schools have tended to involve changes in curriculum and school social relationships with only slight involvement of adults from the neighbourhood (Moon 1983). And this means that projects calling themselves 'community education' have actually been versions of progressivism, conceived and implemented solely by educationalists. Power, in other words, has not devolved. Recalling Lukes' (1974) three dimensional theory of power, we can see that community education is concerned with the level of decision making and doesn't really come to grips with the 'third dimension' of power in which cultural attitudes contribute to patterns of domination. It is impossible to advocate the devolution of educational power to parents without taking into account cultural factors which will influence their perceptions and choices. If these cultural factors are hegemonic, i.e., if they exist at tacit levels of awareness and are in reinforcing relationships with broad patterns of social inequality, simply devolving educational decision making power may not have desirable effects on curriculum and pedagogy. But on the other hand, devolving power may alter, over time, the attitudes of parents by enabling them to alter their common sense assumptions about schooling through their actual participation in it (see Carspecken 1985 for an empirical study of the effects of parental involvement in schools).

Boyd (1977) criticises community education through an analysis of power, though not by reference to cultural attitudes but rather by questioning the very possibility of devolving decision making power itself. He points out that the goal of community education is to unify actual 'community action' with learning. Power thus isn't simply a question of decisions over the form and content of schooling but also over the ability to mobilise resources to change conditions in the locality:

> Involvement of those living in the neighbourhood so that they cease to perceive themselves as recipients, and see themselves as agents bringing about change would seem to be a necessary condition...Yet, paradoxically, it would seem that people in the inner city are powerless to bring about change of and by themselves. Much therefore

> seems to depend on the growth of neighbourhood and community awareness as a facilitator of change. (1977, pp 16-17)

Boyd cites Halsey and Midwinter themselves (1972, 1972) for evidence of the powerlessness typifying inner city areas. But he draws a different conclusion from it than they do. The radical version of community education implies the devolution of more than just educational power - it must involve the devolution of the command of a score of resources which are in the hands of the local government. He puts his finger on the point made repeatedly by Habermas (1976) and Offe (1975a, 1975b) that welfare capitalism has put citizens in the client role rather than in the participant role. Community education could challange the citizen-state relationship of welfare capitalism generally, not just in the particular case of schooling. Thus:

> it seems to us that educational provision alone cannot solve even the problems of educational poverty, if only because in this sphere there are *no* purely educational problems. (Coates and Silburn 1970, p 73; cited in Boyd 1977, p 10).

In fact, Midwinter and Halsey both formulated their theories of community education within a basically pluralist framework. Their assumption was that *institutional channels* must be created for working class adults to gain access to decision making power. Their suggestions place little emphasis on linkages between educational decision making and other forms of decision making, i.e., structural or systematic relations between domination existing on a number of separate sites in society. Midwinter's comments on the state reveal his pluralist assumptions: he seems to attribute conflict between citizens and the state solely to *attitudes*:

> There should not be this feeling that school is a part of the establishment, a sector of the 'them' ranged over against 'us'. There should not be this depressing gap between what is the state's and what is the individual's. The state versus the individual is a sad phrase. The state is a conglomeration of individuals and an association of communities. (1973, p 79)

But, 'sad' though the phrase may be, the state versus the individual is a fact of modern capitalism. Merson and Campbell (1974) argue that the asymmetrical distribution of power in modern urban complexes is a fact which virtually makes the goals of community education an impossibility:

> Crucially, in the context of the present discussion, decisions about the provision of housing, education and employment reside in an economic elite who exist physically outside the area, and access to this elite, and therefore to the decision-making processes, is not in the gift of the inhabitants of the oppressed area. (p 44)

Their conclusion is that community education is not possible aside from a general programme of altering power relationships.

Another objection to community education has been the argument that it seeks to create a different type of education for working class children which would undoubtedly be regarded as 'second class' in society as a whole and which would thus simply exacerbate the disadvantages facing the working class on the job market. Halsey (1972) himself was not unaware of the problem, but argued that traditional curricula in comprehensive schools would enable only a small minority of the working class to move upwards in society. Since the bulk of working class children have to face futures within deprived communities, a different type of education, geared to making empowered adults capable of changing their environment, seem justified to Midwinter. He emphasises that the goals of a community curriculum include the *improvement* of the transmission of traditional skills and thus the possibility of actually increasing mobility at the same time that it empowers groups for making changes in their social environment (1972, p 29). In other words, mobility need not be ruled out in a community school for those few pupils who would be mobile through more traditional schools.

But a more realistic recognition of this problem by an advocate of community education can be found in the work of David Hargreaves (1982), who argues that until standard national examinations are eliminated, there is little chance of developing genuine community curricula which is not regarded as inferior in comparison to the traditional curriculum. Examinations, he argues, are the strongest tie between education and the job market, and as long as this tie exists examination results will continue to be the highest priority in teachers' and parents' minds. His recommended solution is to abolish the examination system, make community studies and expressive arts compulsory in all secondary schools, and thereby free educators to introduce forms of curriculum and pedagogy which correspond to the real experiences of pupils in their local communities (1982, p 128).

In fact it would seem that any interpretation of the radical version of community education would lead logically to the decision to abolish or greatly modify the examination system, and not just for the reasons put forth by Hargreaves. On the level of the relationship between education and the state, examinations further tie all provided education to the logic of the job market. The usefulness of knowledge under an examination system becomes above all its translation into a certificate which can be used to get jobs. Any other attempt to introduce usefulness into knowledge becomes only secondary. In fact, examinations contribute to a general ideology of the purpose of education as solely being employability (CCCS 1981). Of course, standard examinations were initially viewed as a great

opportunity for subordinate classes because they have opened up avenues of mobility. But the work of the political arithmetic school has shown beyond a doubt that even after 35 years of standard examinations, lower class children on the whole can still expect a future of only lower class jobs or unemployment (Halsey et al 1980) while examinations make this situation appear legitimate (Broadfoot 1979, p 40, Bourdieu and Passeron 1977). The privilege brought by the standard examination system to people of all classes to compete nationwide is a modern form of the paradoxical winning of state provided education by the working class during the 19th century:

> Far indeed from promising liberation, provided education threatened subjection. It seemed at best a laughable and irrelevant divergence (*useless* knowledge in fact); or at worst a species of tyranny. (Johnson, 1979a p 78).

And examinations appear tyrannical in other ways as well. If the goal of community education is to teach participation and to empower pupils with respect to their environments, then the whole presentation of knowledge ought to be one in which knowledge is seen by the pupils to be a social product to which they can contribute and about which they can raise criticisms. Examinations contribute enormously to what Whitty and Young (1976) call 'commodity knowledge', i.e., objective knowledge possessed by one (the teacher) and not by another (the pupil or parent) and which can be neutrally transmitted from the former to the latter. Commodity knowledge is a reification of an essentially fallible social product with necessary ideological effects (Whitty 1977, Young and Whitty 1977, Wexler 1982, Giroux 1983). Examinations play a large role in this process of reification by making knowledge measurable and 'thing-like', which one either has or doesn't have. As one of the early representatives of the 'new' sociology of education writes:

> [teachers] remain imprisoned in the service of a reality from which creation and transformation have been removed. ... The pupil's relations to knowledge becomes that of reproducing the known, the teacher's that of evaluating the quality of that reproduction according to certain standards.
>
> Hextall, quoted in Whitty, 1977 p 65

Examinations are thus another aspect of the 'third dimension of power'. They serve both to impose a passive attitude on the part of pupils and parents towards the knowledge produced by members of a specific stratum of society (Apple 1984), to lead members of subordinate groups to doubt their own production of knowledge in day to day life, and to form the basis of teacher authority over pupils and parents.

Pupil resistance has been yet another problem with experiments in community education. Reports from Neil Thompson on the Abraham Moss Centre, from Bob Evans

on Countesthorpe College, Mervyn Flecknoe on the Sutton Centre, and Bob Moon on Stantonbury Campus (all in Moon 1983) all refer to initial periods of pupil disruption in their experimental schools. As Moon explains in the representative case of his own school, pupils came to the new institution with already deeply ingrained attitudes: 'Ideas about school and what school stood for had been established both by personal experience elsewhere as well as by the expectations of family, friends and the world at large' (1983, p 68). And these 'ideas' included patterns of resisting school authority which were capable of even greater expression in the 'pupil-centred' atmospheres of these schools. Yet all the contributors to Moon's book argued that pupil disruption decreased over time (two to three years) and that they expected the problem to continue to decrease as yet more time goes by (sees Moon's summary, p 148). It will be seen that pupil resistance was a major feature of the Croxteth occupation which had an effect on the development of school organisation and authority relationships.

Lastly, another problem which has faced practitioners of community education has been the lack of practical ideas and appropriate materials available. Neil Thompson (1983, p 38), for example, reports that at the Abraham Moss Centre in Manchester, an alternative curriculum was first attempted but later dropped because no materials and already thought-out programmes existed which teachers could draw upon. Teachers tried to make their own materials at first and to plan projects, but found that the time demands on teaching alone left them little surplus for additional activities:

> If the ground had been better understood; if the ideas had been previously rehearsed, there would have been fewer difficulties. (p 39)

And this problem proved insurmountable even though the staff at the Abraham Moss Centre had been carefully selected for their enthusiasm. This problem of a lack of formulated alternatives is, of course, lessened by the pioneering efforts of schools like Countesthorpe, the Sutton Centre, and the Abraham Moss Centre themselves. But it is rooted in a more general problem: the lack of what can be called a 'counter-hegemony' in educational ideology and practice. As Broadfoot (1979) points out, traditional educational practice and ideology is so deeply embedded within a narrow framework of assumptions held by policy makers, teachers and parents alike, that even when clear alternatives are formulated in theory they aren't taken very seriously.

To summarise, theoretical objections and practical problems found with community education fall into five areas:

1) Parental attitudes which originate in local cultures and which, we've argued, may exist in reinforcing relationships to society-wide patterns of domination.

2) Power which cannot be reduced to one of simply creating more institutional avenues for parental access to decision making processes concerning education alone.

3) Examinations which reinforce a reified view of knowledge, back up traditional forms of teacher authority, reinforce the 'common sensical' view that the main purpose of education is employability (and thus tightly tie the logic of schooling to the commodification process - see Offe, 1974, 1985).

4) Pupil resistance which has deep cultural roots and a relationship to the structural location of schools (Willis 1977, McRobbie 1978, Everhart 1983, Apple 1983, Giroux 1983).

5) Lack of available alternatives to traditional educational practice upon which teachers (and parents) can draw. In Gramsci's terms, this could be phrased as the lack of a counter-hegemony with respect to educational purposes and practices.

I suggested above that many of these problems stem from limitations in the implicit theory of power used by advocates of community education. The key hypothesis of community education theory, as we've seen from table 1, is that educational decision making power is an independent variable. The devolution of power to community adults is then proposed as a solution to the undesirable dependent variables focused upon in this approach: the imposition of a sense of failure, incompetence and impotence in pupils of the lower classes. But this is only a one-, or at best a two-, dimensional theory of power. Power relations are instantiated in ways other than access to decision making, through ideology and hegemony. In education, ideology and hegemony take forms within the attitudes held by people towards the purposes and 'proper' forms of schooling, through the reification of knowledge, and the examination system. For the features of schooling singled out by advocates of community education for change (table 1) to be altered, complex patterns of domination existing on many dimensions and sites would have to be challenged. In terms of action theory, the participants in community education would have to gain an increased awareness of the conditions in which they act within the school. Moreover, in addition to gaining an awareness of hegemonic and ideological elements forming the conditions in which they think and act, they would have to have two other things: the means to construct alternative actions in theory and the power to implement these alternatives in practice. The five problems listed above suggest that a combination of all three of these needs; awareness, alternative perspectives and power, is unlikely to occur, especially if community education remains a state policy, that is, yet another service offered by the welfare state.

Since the radical version of community education challenges the client-administrator relationship of the welfare state, it is certainly problematical to make community education an official policy. This doesn't mean that a state policy of community schooling is totally self-contradictory, but simply that such policies are difficult to achieve, there is a tension built into the situation between the form (a state policy) and the ideal content (an alteration of the client-administrator relationship). As Boyd many times stresses in his critique:

> the idea of the community school did not come from the grass roots but has been developed by researchers concerned with the regeneration of inner-city neighbourhoods. (Boyd 1977, p 12)

And thus what usually results is a moderate rather than a radical version of the ideal.

Abercrombie, Nicholas; (1980) *Class, Structure and Knowledge*; Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher

Adorno, T. W.; (1964) *The Authoritarian Personality*; New York: John Wiley and Sons

Aminzade, Ronald; (1973) 'Revolution and Collective Political Violence: The case of the Working Class of Marseille, France 1830-1871'; Working Paper £86, Centre for Research on Social Organisation

Anderson, Perry; (1976) *Considerations of Western Marxism*; London: NLB

Anderson, Perry; (1980) *Arguments within English Marxism*; London: Verso Press

Anyon, J.; (1978) 'Elementary social studies textbooks and legitimating knowledge'; *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 6(3)

Anyon, J.; (1979) 'Ideology and United States history textbooks'; *Harvard Educational Review*, 49(3)

Anyon, J.; (1981) 'Elementary schooling and distinctions of social class'; Interchange, 12 (2/3)

Apel, Karl Otto; (1981) *Charles S. Pierce, From Pragmatism to Pragmaticism*; trans. by Krois, John M.; Amherst, MA: University of Massachusestts Press

Apple, Michael; (1979) *Ideology and Curriculum*; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Apple, Michael (ed.); (1982) *Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education*; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Apple, Michael; (1983) *Education and Power*; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Apple, Michael; (1984) 'The political economy of text publishing'; *Educational Theory*, 34

Bachrach, P. and Baratz, M.; (1970) *Power and Poverty*: New York: Oxford University Press

Barton, L. and Meighan, R. (eds.); (1979) *Schools, Pupils, and Deviance*; Driffield: Nafferton Books

Barton, L. and Walker, S. (eds.); (1983) *Race, Class and Education*; London: Croom Helm

Bell, Colin and Newby, Howard; (1971) *Community Studies*; Allen and Unwin

Becker, H.S. (1953) 'Becoming a marihuana user', *American Journal of Sociology*, 59, 235-42

Beechey, V. (1977) 'Some notes on female wage labour in capitalist production', *Capital and Class*, Autumn 1977, no. 3

Bell, Colin and Newby, Howard; (1976) 'Community, communion, class and community action'; in Herbert, D. and Johnson, R. (eds.) 1976

Bendix, Reinhard; (1960) *Max Weber. An Intellectual Portrait*; New York

Berg, Leila; (1968) *Risinghill: Death of a Comprehensive School*; Harmondsworth: Pelican Books

Bernstein, Basil; (1977) 'Social class, language and socialisation'; in Karabel and Halsey (eds.), 1977

Bernstein, Richard J.; (1971) *Praxis and Action*; Philadelaphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Bernstein, Richard J.; (1976) *The Restructuring of Social and Political Theory*; New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich

Bernstein, Richard J.; (1983) *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism; Science, Hermeneutics, and Praxis*; Philadelaphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Beyme, K.; (1974) *German Political Studies*; Sage Publications

Beynon, Huw; (1973) *Working for Ford*; London: Penguin

Bhaskar, R. (1975) *A Realist Theory of Science*, Leeds: Leeds Books

Bhaskar, R. (1979) *The Possibility of Naturalism*, Brighton: Harvester

Bland, L., Brunsdon, C., Hobson, D. and Winship, J. (1978) 'Women "inside and outside" the relations of production', in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (eds.), 1978

Blumer, Herbert; (1951) 'Collective Behaviour'; in Lee, A. M. 1951

Bogdan, Robert and Taylor, Steven; (1975) *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods, A Phenomenological Approach to the Social Sciences*; John Wiley and Sons

Borja, Jordi; (1977) 'Urban Movements in Spain'; in Harloe, M. 1977

Bottomore, T. (ed.); (1983) *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*; Basil Blackwell

Bourdieu, Pierre; (1977a) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*; London: Cambridge University Press

Bourdieu, Pierre; (1977b) *Symbolic Power*; Birmingham: CCCS Stencilled Occasional Papers

Bourdieu, Piere and Passeron, Jean-Claude; (1977) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*; London: Sage Publications

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H.; (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America*; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Boyd, John; (1977) *Community Education and Urban Schools*; London: Longman

Broadfoot, Patricia; (1979) *Assessment, Schools and Society*; Metheun

Brown, Peter and Ferguson, Steve; (1982) 'Schools and population change in Liverpool'; in Gould and Hodgkiss 1982, Ch. 13

Brown, Richard (ed.); (1973) *Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change*; London: Tavistock

Bruegel, I. (1979) 'Women as reserve army of labour: a note on recent British experience', *Feminist Review*, issue 3.

Buhr, W. and Frederick, P. (eds.); (1982) *Planning in Stagnating Regions*; Baden Baden

Burgess, Robert G. (ed.); (1982) *Field Research: A Sourcebook and Field Manual*; London: Allen and Unwin

Burgess, Robert G.; (1982a) 'The unstructured interview as a *conversation', in Burgess 1982*

Cantril, Hadley; (1941) *The Psychology of Social Movements*; New *York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.*

Caplan, Nathan and Paige, Jeffery M.; (1968) 'A study of ghetto rioters"; *Scientific American*, August 1968 219:15-21

Carspecken, Phil; (1983) 'What kind of education?', *Schooling and Culture* Issue 13 Summer

Carspecken, Phil; (1985) 'Community action and community schooling: the campaign to save Croxteth Comprehensive'; in Walford, G. 1985 ch. 5

Carspecken, Phil and Miller, Henry; (1983) 'Parental choice and community control: the case of Croxteth Comprehensive'; in Wolpe and Donald 1983

Carspecken, Phil and Miller, Henry; (1984) 'Community education in Croxteth'; *Forum*, Autumn 1984

Carspecken, Phil and Miller, Henry; (1984) 'Croxteth Comprehensive: curriculum and social relationships in an occupied school'; *Socialism and Education*, vol. 11, no.1

Castells, Manuel; (1977) *The Urban Question*; London: Edward Arnold

Castells, Manuel; (1978) *City, Class and Power*; London: Macmillan Press

Castells, Manuel; (1983) *The City and the Grass Roots*; Australia: Edward Arnold

Central Advisory Council for Education; (1963) *Half Our Future, a report of the central advisory council for education* (Newsome report); London: H.M.S.O

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS); (1977) *On Ideology*; London: Hutchinson

Centre for Contemproary Cultural Studies (CCCS); (1978) *Women Take Issue*; London: Hutchinson

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS); (1981) *Unpopular Education, Schooling and Social Democracy in England since 1944* London: Hutchinson and Company

Chorley, R.J. (ed.); (1973) *Directions in Geography*; Andover: Metheun

Clarke, John; Critcher, Chas; Johnson, Richard; (1979) *Working Class Culture; Studies in history and theory*; London: Hutchinson and Co

Clarke S, and Ginsburg, N.; (1975) 'The political economy of housing'; *In Political Economy of Housing Workshop, Political economy and the housing question*. Conference of Socialist Economists, London

Clegg, S.; (1975) *Power, Rule and Domination*; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Clegg, S.; (1974) *The Theory of Power and Organization*; Henley-on-Thames, Oxon: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Coates, K. and Silburn, R.; (1970) 'Education in Poverty'; in Rubenstein, D. and Stoneman, C; (eds.) *Education for Democracy*

Cockburn, Cynthia; (1977) *The Local State; Management of Cities and People*; London: Pluto Press

Cohen, Jean; (1982) 'Crisis management and social movements'; *Telos*, No. 52, pp 24-41

Cohen, Jean; (1983) 'Rethinking social movements'; *Berkeley Journal of Sociology 28* (1983), 97-113

Cohen, Jean; (1985) 'Strategy or identity: new theoretical paradigms and contemporary social movements'; *Social Research*, vol. 52, No. 4, Winter 1985

Coleman, James S.; (1957) *Community Conflict*; New York: Free Press

Coleman, James S.; (1973) 'Loss of power'; *American Sociological Review*, Feb. 38:1-17

Connell, R.W., Ashenden, D.J., Kessler1, S.,; Dowsett, G.W. (1982) *Making the Difference*; Sydney: Allen and Unwin

Cormack, Margaret; (1980) *Liverpool Housing: Facts and Figures*; Liverpool Council for Voluntary Service

Coser, Lewis; (1956) *The Functions of Social Conflict*; Glencoe, ILL.: Free Press

Coser, Lewis; (1967) *Continuties in the Study of Social Conflict*; New York: Free Press

Cottle, Thomas (1982) 'The life study: on mutual recognition and the subjective inquiry' in Burgess 1982

Crenson, Matthew A.; (1971) *The Unpolitics of Air Polution*; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press

Crick, Michael; (1984) *Militant*; London: Faber and Faber;

Croxteth Area Working Party; (1983) *Croxteth Area, Report of the Working Party appointed to consider the needs of the area*; Liverpool City Council

Dahl, R.; (1956) *Preface to Democratic Theory*; Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Dahl, R.; (1961) *Who Governs?*; New Haven: Yale University Press

Dahl, R.; (1963) *Modern Political Analysis*; Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall

Dale, R.; (1979) 'Control, accountability and William Tyndale'; in Barton, L. and Meighan, R. (eds.) 1979

Dale, R.; (1982) 'Education and the Capitalist State: contributions and contradictions'; in Apple, M. (ed.) 1982

Davies, James C.; (1962) 'Toward a theory of revolution'; *American Sociological Review* 27, Feb. 1962

Davies, James C.; (1969) 'The J-curve of rising and declining satisfactions as a cause of some great revolutions and a contained rebellion'; in Graha, Hugh D. and Gurr, Ted R. (eds.) 1969

Davis, Jerome; (1930) *Contemporary Social Movements*;

Denzin, N.K. (1970) *The Research Action in Sociology*; London: Butterworth

Department of Education and Science; (1982) *Report by HM Inspectors on Educational Provision by Liverpool Education Authority in the Toxteth Area*; London: DES

Dingwall, R. (1980) 'The Ethnomethodological Movement', in Payne et al, 1980

Douglas, J.W.B.; (1964) *Home and School*; London: MacGibbon and Kee

Dunleavey, Patrick; (1979) 'The urban basis of political alignment'; *British Journal of Political Science*, V.9, pt.4

Dunleavy, Patrick; (1980) *Urban Political Analysis, the politics of collective consumption*; London: Macmillan Press Ltd

Durkheim, Emile; (1982) *The Rules of Sociological Method*; London: Macmillan

Entwistle, H.; (1979) *Antonio Gramsci; Conservative Schooling for Radical Politics*; Routledge and Kegan Paul

Evans, Bob; (1983) 'The Countesthrope Team System: Towards the 'mini' School'; in Moon, Bob 1983

Evans-Pritchard, E. E.; (1962) *Essays in Social Anthropology*; London: Faber and Faber;

Evans-Pritchard, E. E.; (1971) *Anthropology and History*; Humanities Press

Everhart, Robert B.; (1983) *Reading, Writing and Resistance: Adolescence and Labor in a Junior High School*; Routledge and Kegan Paul

Eysenck, Hans; (1954) *The Psychology of Politics*; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Feagin, Joe R. and Han, Harlan; (1973) *Ghetto Revolts, The Politics of Violence in American Cities*; London: Collier-Macmillan Publishers

Ferguson, Steven and Brown, Peter; (1982) 'Issues relating to decision making in the planning of of inner city primary school provision'; in Buhr, W. and Frederick, P. (eds.) 1982

Feuer, Lewis; (1969) *The Conflict of Generations*; New York: Basic Books

Flecknoe, Mervyn; (1983) 'The Sutton Centre, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire: A Philosophy of Assessment'; in Moon, Bob (ed.) 1983

Fletcher, Colin; (1980) 'Developments in Community Education: A Current Account'; in Fletcher and Thompson, 1980

Fletcher, Colin and Thompson, Neil (eds.); (1980) *Issues in Community Education*; Barcombe (Sussex): Falmer Press

Floud, J. Halsey, A.H. and Martin, F. (eds.); (1957) *Social Class and Educational Opportunity*; London: Hinemann

Freman, J. (ed.); (1983) *Social Movements of the Sixties and Seventies*; New York: Longman

Friend, Andrew; (1981) *Failed Strategies, Falling Investment; Liverpool's Housing Programme and Government Policy*; London: The Catholic Housing Aid Society

Galton, Maurice and Moon, Bob; (1983) *Changing Schools, Changing Curriculum*; Harper and Row

Galtung, Johan; (1964) 'A Structural Theory of Aggression'; *The Journal of Peace Research*, 1,2 1964 pp95-115

Gamson, William A.; (1975) *The Strategy of Social Protest*; Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press

Gans, Herbert (1982) 'Observations on the personal aspects of fieldwork', in Burgess 1982

Garfinkle, Harold; (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*; Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall

Giddens, Anthony; (1976) *New Rules of Sociological Method*; London: Hutchinson and Co

Giddens, Anthony; (1977) *Studies in Social and Political Theory*; (1977); London: Hutchinson

Giddens, Anthony; (1979) *Central Problems in Social Theory*; London: Macmillan Press Ltd

Giddens, Anthony; (1981) *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism, vol. 1: Power, Property and the State*; London: Macmillan

Giddens, Anthony; (1982) *Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory*; London: Macmillan

Giddens, Anthony; (1984) *The Constitution of Society*; Cambridge: Polity Press

Gintis, H. and Bowles, S. (1981) 'Contradiction and reproduction in educational theory'; in Dale, R. et al (eds.) *Education and the State*, V. 1

Giroux, Henry; (1981) *Ideology, Culture and the Process of Schooling*; Philadelphia: Temple University Press

Giroux, Henry A.; (1983) *Theory and Resistance in Education; A Pedagogy for the Opposition*; London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd

Glass, D. V. (ed.); (1954) *Social Mobility in Britain*; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Goffman, Irving; (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*; New York: Doubleday

Goffman, Irving; (1971) *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*; New York: Harper and Row

Gorbutt, D. (1972) 'The new sociology of education', *Education for Teaching*, 89

Graha, Hugh D. and Gurr, Ted R.; (1969) *Violence in America*; New York: Bantam

Habermas, Jurgen; (1976) *Legitimation Crisis*; Boston: Heinemann

Habermas, Jurgen; (1978) *Knowledge and Human Interests*, 2nd ed.; translated by J. Shapiro; London: Heinemann Educational

Habermas, Jurgen; (1981) 'New social movements'; *Telos*, No. 49, Autumn 1981

Habermas, Jurgen; (1981) *The Theory of Communicative Action, vol 1: Reason and the Rationalisation of Society*; Boston: Beacon Press

Hagerstrand, T.; (1973) 'The domain of human geography'; in Chorley, R.J. (ed.) 1973

Hall, Stuart; (1977); 'The hinterland of science: ideology and the sociology of knowledge', in CCCS 1977

Halsey, A.H. (ed.); (1972) *Educational Priority*; London: HMSO

Halsey, A.H., Heath, A.F., and Ridge, J.M.; (1980) *Origins and Destinations*; Oxford: Clarendon Press

Hammersley, Martyn; (1983) *The Ethnography of Schooling*; Driffield: Nafferton Books

Hammersley, Martyn and Atkinson, Paul; (1983) *Ethnography, Principles in Practice*; London: Tavistock

Hargreaves, David; (1967) *Social Relations in a Secondary School*; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Hargreaves, David H.; (1982) *The Challenge of the Comprehensive School, Cuture, Curriculum and Community*; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd

Harloe, Michael; (1977) *Captive Cities*; Wiley

Hatch, S. and Moyland, S.; (1972) 'The role of the community school'; In Raynor and Harden 1973 vol 2

Hegel, Georg; (1967) *The Phenomenology of Mind*; translated by J.B. Baillie; New York: Harper Torchbooks

Hegel, Georg; (1974) *Hegel, the Essential Writings*: Ch. 6; edited by Frederick Weiss; New York: Harper and Row

Herberle, Rudolf; (1951) *Social Movements*; New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts

Herbert, D. and Johnson, R.; (1976) *Social Areas in Cities*; Wiley

Hirst, Paul; (1977) 'Economic classes and politics'; In Hunt, (ed.) 1977

Hobsbawn, Eric J.; (1959) *Primitive Rebels, Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries*; Manchester: Manchester Free Press

Hoffer, Eric; (1951) *The True Believer*; New York: Harper and Row

Hunt, Alan; (1977) *Class and Class Structure*; London: Lawrence and Wishart

Hyde, Francis E.; (1971) *Liverpool and the Mersey; The Development of a Port, 1700-1970)*; Newton Addot: David and Charles Ltd

Jenkins, J. Craig; (1983) 'Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements'; *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9 1983: 527-553

Johnson, Richard; (1979) 'Culture and the historians'; in CCCS 1979

Johnson, Richard; (1979a) '"Really Useful Knowledge": radical education and working-class culture, 1790-1848'; In Clarke, Critcher and Johnson (eds.) 1979

Johnson, Richard; (1979b) 'Three problematics: elements of a theory of working class culture'; in Clarke, Critcher and Johnson 1979

Johnson, Richard; (1983) *What is Cultural Studies Anyway?*; CCCS Stenciled Occasional Paper, 74

Jones, P., Smith, George, Pulham, K.; (1975) *All Their Future, A study of the Problems of a Group of School Leavers in a Disadvantaged Area of Liverpool*; Oxford: Oxford University Press

Karabel, J. and Halsey, A.H. (eds.); (1977) *Power and Ideology in Education*; New York: Oxford University Press

Kaye, Harvey J.; (1984) *The British Marxist Historians, An Introductory Analysis*; Cambridge: Polity Press

Keat, R. and Urry, J. (1975) *Social Theory as Science*; London: Routledge

Keddie, N.; (1971a) 'Classroom knowledge'; in Young 1971

Keddie, N.; (1971b) *Tinker, Tailor...The Myth of Cultural Deprivation*, Introduction; Harmondsworth: Penguin;

Knorr-Cetina, K. and Cicourel, A. (eds.); (1981) *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology, Towards an Integration of Micro- and Macro- Analysis*; Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Kornhauser, William; (1959) *The Politics of Mass Society*; Glencoe, ILL: Free Press

Kraushaar, Robert; (1981) 'Policy without protest: the dilemma of organising for change in Britain'; In Harloe, 1981

Lacey, Collin; (1970) *Hightown Grammar*; Manchester: Manchester University Press

Larrain, Jorge; (1979) *The Concept of Ideology*; London: Hutchinson

LeBon, Gustave; (1896) *The Crowd*; London: Ernest Benn

Lee, Alfred M. (ed.); (1951) *New Outlines of the Principles of Sociology*; New York: Barnes and Noble Books

Liverpool City Council; (1984) *Campaign Bulletin*; Issue 1, January 1984;

Liverpool City Council; (1983) *Policy and Finance Report*: A14;

Liverpool City Council Joint Steward's Committee; (1983) *Bulletin*, Liverpool City Planning Department; (1982) *Planning Information Digest: Economy 1982*; Liverpool City Council; Liverpool,

Liverpool Education Committee; (1977) *Statistics of Education*; 1965-Liverpool City Council;

Liverpool Education Committee; (1978) *Reorganisation of Non-Roman Catholic Secondary Schools*; Liverpool City Council;

Liverpool Education Committee; (1983) *Proposals for County Secondary Reorganisation, A consultative document*; Liverpool City Council

Liverpool Education Committee; (1965-1977) *Statistics of Education*; Liverpool City Council

Liverpool Policy and Finance Committee; (1973) *Provision of amenities on the Croxteth Estate; Report of the Chief Executive and Town Clerk*; Liverpool City Council, TC/181/73

Liverpool Education Committee; (1978-1984) *Form 7 Statistics*

Lojkine, Jean; (1977) 'Big firms: strategies, urban policy and urban social movements'; in Harloe, M. 1977

Lovett, Tom; (1975) *Adult Education, Community Development, and the Working Class*

Lovett, T. Clarke, C. and Kilmurray, A.; (1984) *Adult Education and Community Action*; Beckenham: Croom Helm

Lukes, Steven; (1974) *Power, a Radical View*; London: Macmillan

MacCormack, Carol P.; (1980) 'Nature, culture, and gender: a critique'; in ibid: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

MacKinnon, Catharine A.; (1982) 'Feminism, marxism, method, and the state: an agenda for theory'; *Signs*: Spring 1982

Marcuse, Herbert; (1964) *One Dimensional Man*; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Markova, Ivana; (1982) *Paradigms, Thought and Language*; Wiley-Interscience

Marriner, Sheila; (1982) *The Economic and Social Development of Merseyside*; London: Croom Helm Ltd

Marx, Gary T. and Wood, James L.; (1975) 'Strands of theory and research in collective behaviour'; *Annual Review of Sociology* 1, 1975:368-428

Marx, Karl; (1977) *Early Writings*; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books

Marx, Karl; 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte'; In *Complete Works*, vol. 11

Marx, Karl; 'Theses on Feuerbach'; In *Complete Works*, vol. 5

Marx, Karl and Engles, Frederick; (1976) *Complete Works*; London: Lawrence and Wishart

Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick; 'The German Ideology'; In *Complete Works*, vol. 5

Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick; 'Manifesto of the Communist Party'; In *Complete Works*, vol. 6

McCarthy, Thomas; (1982) *The Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas*; Cambridge MA: MIT Press

McClosky, Herbert; (1964) 'Consensus and Ideology in American Politics'; *American Political Science Review* 58, 361-82

McRobbie, A.; (1978) 'Working class girls and the culture of feminity'; in CCCS 1978

Mead, George Herbert; (1967) *Mind, Self, and Society, from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*; Chicago: Phoenix Books

Mehan, H. (1979) *Learning Lessons: Social Organisation in the Classroom*; Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press

Melucci, Alberto; (1985) 'The symbolic challenge of contemporary movements'; (1985); *Social Research*, Vol. 52, No. 4, Winter 1985, pp 789 - 816

Merson, M. and Campbell, R.; (1974) 'Community Education: Instruction for Inequality'; in *Education for Teaching*, No. 93, Spring 1974

Merton, Robert K.; (1957) *Social Theory and Social Structure*; Glencoe, Ill: Free Press of Glencoe

Midwinter, Eric; (1972) *Priority Education*; Harmondsworth: Penguin

Midwinter, Eric; (1973) *Patterns of Community Education*; London: Ward Lock Educational

Midwinter, Eric; (1975) *Education and the Community*; London: Allen and Unwin

Miliband, R.; (1973) *The State in Capitalist Society*; London: Quartet

Miliband, Ralph; (1977) *Marxism and Politics*; London: Oxford University Press

Moon, Bob (ed.); (1983a) *Comprehensive Schools: Challenge and Change*; Windsor: NFER-Nelson Publishing Co, Ltd

Moon, Bob; (1983b) 'Stantonbury Campus, Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire: A study in teacher responses to innovation'; in Moon, Bob (ed.) 1983a

Oberschall, Anthony; (1973) *Social Conflict and Social Movements*; Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall

O'Connor, J.; (1973) *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*; New York: St Martin's Press

Offe, Claus; (1974) 'Structural problems of the capitalist state'; in Beyme, K. vol 1, 1974

Offe, Claus; (1975a) 'Legitimacy versus effeciency'; in Offe 1984

Offe, Claus; (1975b) 'The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation'; in Linderberg et al, 1975

Offe, Claus; (1975c) 'Theses on the theory of the state'; in Offe 1984

Offe, Claus; (1974) *Contradictions of the Welfare State*; London: Hutchinson - Keane, J. (ed.)

Offe, Claus; (1985) 'New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics', in *Social Research*, Vol. 52, No. 4, Winter 1985

Pahl, Ray E. (ed.); (1968) *Readings in Urban Sociology*; London: Pergamon Press

Park, Robert; (1952) *Human Communities*; New York: Free Press

Park, Robert and Burgess, Roderick; (1967) *The City*; Chicago: London University of Chicago

Parsons, Talcot; (1951) *The Social System*; Glencoe, ILL.: The Press Press

Parsons, Talcot; (1960) 'The Distribution of Power in American Society'; in Parsons, (ed.) 1960

Parsons, Talcot (ed.); (1960) *Structure and Process in Modern Societies*; New York: Free Press

Payne, G., Dingwall, R., Payne J., and Carter, M. (eds.); (1981) *Sociology and Social Research*, London: Croom Hela

Pickvance, Chris (ed.); (1976) *Urban Sociology: Critical Essays*; London: Methuen and Co Ltd

Pickvance, Chris (ed.); (1977) 'From social base to social force: some analytical issues in the study of urban protest'; in Harloe, M. 1977

Pierce, Charles Sanders; (1931-35) *Collectived Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*; Edited by Hartshorne, C. and Weiss, Paul; Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press

Piven, F. and Cloward, R.; (1979) *Poor People's Movements: Why they Succeed, How they Fail*; New York: Vintage Books

Pizzorno, A.; (1978a) 'Political exchange and collective identity in industrial conflict'; in Crouch, C. and Pizzorno, A.; (eds.) 1978

Pizzorno, A. and Crouch, C. (eds.); (1978b) *The Resurgence of Class Conflict in Western Eurpope since 1968*; London: Macmillan

Pizzorno, A.; (1985) 'On the rationality of democratic choice'; *Telos*, No 63, Spring 1985: 41-69

Polsby, Nelson W.; (1963) *Community Power and Political Theory*; New Haven: Yale University Press

Poster, Cyril; (1982) *Community Education, Its Development and Management*; London: Heinemann Educational Books

Poulantzas, N.; (1973) *Political Power and Social Classes*; New Left Books

Poulantzas, N.; (1975) *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism*; New Left Books

Raynor, J. and Harden, J. (eds.); (1972) *Equality and City Schools, Readings in Urban Education*, vol. 2; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Rex, John; (1968) 'The sociology of a zone of transition'; In Pahl, R. 1968

Rex, John and Moore, Robert; (1967) *Race, Community, and Conflict*; Oxford: Oxford University Press

Roberts, Ron. E. and Kloss, Robert M.; (1979) *Social Movements: Between the Balcony and the Barricade*; St. Louis: C.V. Mosby

Rokeach, Milton; (1960) *The Open and Closed Mind*; New York: Basic Books

Salter, Brian and Tapper, Ted; (1981) *Education, Politics and the State; The Theory and Practice of Educational Change*; London: Grant McIntyre Ltd

Sartre, Jean-Paul; (1974) *Essays in Existentialism*; Secaucus: New Jersey

Sartre, Jean-Paul; *Being and Nothingness, An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*; New York: Philosophical Library

Saunders, Peter; (1983) *Urban Politics, a Sociological Interpretation*; London: Hutchinson

Saunders, Peter; (1981) *Social Theory and the Urban Question*; London: Hutchinson

Schattschneider, R.E.; (1963) *The Semi-Sovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*; New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston

Schutz, Alfred and Luckmann, Thomas; (1974) *The Structures of the Life World*; Heinemann

Schwartz, Howard and Jacobs, Jerry; (1979) *Qualitative Sociology, A Method to the Madness*; New York: Free Press

Sharpe, R. and Green, A.; (1975) *Education and Social Control*; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Shotter, John; (1984) *Social Accountability and Selfhood*; Oxford: Blackwell

Silverman, David; (1985) *Qualitative Methodology and Sociology*; Aldershot, Hants: Gower Publishing Company, Ltd

Smelser, Neil; (1963) *Theory of Collective Behaviour*; New York: Free Press

Spender, Dale; (1980) *Man Made Language*; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Spender, Dale; (1982) *Invisible Women, The Schooling Scandal*; London: Writers and Readers

Stinchcombe, Arthur; (1968) *Constructing Social Theories*; New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Tarde, Gabriel; (1969) *On Communication and Social Influence*; Chicago: Phonenix Books

Taylor, Charles; (1979) *Hegel and Modern Society*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Thompson, E.P. (1963) *The Making of the English Working Class*; London: Victor Gollancz, Ltd

Thompson, E.P.; (1975) *Whigs and Hunters*; Haramondsworth: Penguin

Thompson, E.P.; (1978) *The Poverty of Theory and other Essays*; London: Merlin Press

Thompson, John B. and Held, David (eds.); (1982) *Habermas, Critical Debates*; London: Macmillan Press

Thompson, Neil; (1983) 'Abraham Moss Centre, Manchester: The experience of continuing education'; ch 3 in Moon, Bob 1983

Thrift, Nigel J.; (1983) 'On the determination of social action in space and time'; *Society and Space*, 1983, vol. 1, pp 23-57

Tilly, Charles, Tilly, Louise, and Tilly, Richard (1975) *The Rebellious Century, 1830-1930*; London: J.M. Dent and Sons

Tilly, Louise, and Tilly, Charles; (1981) *Class Conflict and Collective Action*; Berverly Hills: Sage Publications

Tilly, Charles; (1985) 'Models and realities of popular collective action'; *Social Research*, Vol. 52, No. 4, Winter 1985, pp 717-747

Toch, Hans; (1965) *The Social Psychology of Social Movements*

Topping, Phil and Smith, George; (1977) *Government Against Poverty?* Liverpool Community Development Project, 1970-75; Home Office

Touraine, Alain; (1977) *The Self Production of Society*; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

Touraine, Alain; (1981) *The Voice and the Eye, An Analysis of Social Movements*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Touraine, Alain; (1985) 'An Introduction to the Study of Social Movements'; *Social Research*, vol. 52, No. 4, Winter 1985

Tremblay, Marc-Adelard; (1982) 'The key informant technique: a non-ethnographic application', in Burgess 1982

Trotter, William; (1916) *Instincts of Herd in Peace and War*; London

Urry, John; (1973) *Reference Groups and the Theory of Revolution*; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Vigier, Francois; (1970) *Change and Apathy, Liverpool and Manchester during the Industrial Revolution*; Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press

Vulliamy, G.; (1976) 'What counts as school music?'; in Whitty, G. and Young, M. (eds.) 1976

Walford, Geoff; (1985) *Schooling in Turmoil*; Beckenham: Croom Helm Ltd

Watts, John (ed.); (1977) *The Countesthrope Experience; The first five years*; London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd

Weber, Max; (1949) *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*; New York: Free Press

Weber, Max; (1968) *Economy and Society*; New York

Wexler, Phil; (1982) 'Structure, text and subject: a critical sociology of school knowledge'; in Apple, M. (ed.) 1982

Whitty, Geoff; (1977) *School Knowledge and Social Control*; Milton Keynes: Open University; Units 14/15 of *Schooling and Society*

Whitty, Geoff; (1985) *Sociology and School Knowledge; Curricular Theory, Research and Politics*; London: Metheun and Co

Whitty, Geoff and Young, M. (eds.); (1976) *Explorations in the Politics of School Knowledge*; Driffield: Nafferton Books

Williams, Raymond; (1973) *The Country and the City*, London: Verso

Williams, Raymond; (1975) *Keywords, A Vocabularly of Culture and Society*; Fontana

Williams, Wyn and Robins, Wayne; (1980) 'Observations on the California Case'; in Fletcher and Thompson 1980

Willis, Paul; (1975) 'How working class kids get working class jobs'; University of Birmingham: Occassional Papers

Willis, Paul; (1977) *Learning to Labour, How Working Class Kids get Working Class Jobs*; London: Gower

Willis, Paul; (1981) 'Cultural production is different from cultural reproduction is different from social rereproduction is different from reproduction; *Interchange*, 12(2/3)

Willis, Paul; (1983) 'Cultural production and theories of reproduction'; in Barton and Walker, 1983

Wilson, R. (ed.); (1970) *Rationality*; Oxford: Basil Blackwell

Wolpe, AnnMarie and Donald, James (eds.); (1983) *Is There Anyone Here from Education? Education after Thatcher*; London: Pluto Press Ltd

Wright, Eric Olin; (1978) *Class, Crisis, and the State*; London: New Left Review Books

Young, M.F.D. (ed.); (1971a) *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*; London: Collier-Macmillian

Young, M.F.D.; (1971b) 'An approach to the study of curricula as social organised knowledge; in Young, M.F.D. (ed.) 1971a

Young, M.F.D. and Whitty, Geoff (eds.); (1977) *Society, State, and Schooling*; Falmer Press

Zald, Mayer N. and McCarthy, John D. (eds.); (1979a) *The Dynamics of Social Movements*; Cambridge: Winthrop

Zald, Mayer N. and McCarthy, John D.; (1979b) 'Utilitarian logic in the resource management perspective'; in Zald and McCarthy, 1979a

Zanden, James; (1963) 'Social Change'; Ch. 6 of *American Minority Relations, The Sociology of Race and Ethnic Relations* New York: The Ronald Press Co